



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Father Furniss and the *Rambler*, a theft under half-a-crown is a venial offence, to be got rid of "by striking one's breast, and being sorry for it at least for a moment;" a theft of ten pounds is a serious matter; one of a hundred pounds ten times as bad; while a bank director, who has opportunities to commit his plunder by thousands, is a monster of iniquity, whose name can be made a byword to express the highest point of all dishonesty. This may be the *Rambler's* scale, but we hesitate not to say that the Searcher of hearts will estimate the guilt of the transgressors according to a very different rule—namely, the state of the heart and conscience of the offender, and not merely the scale on which he had opportunities to carry on his depredations. It is quite possible that the maid servant who has not found it safe to steal more than her mistress's tea and sugar, or the little boy (in his other example) whose temptations or whose opportunities may not have yet proceeded beyond thefts of pennies to buy apples, may, in the sight of God, have betrayed hearts as reckless of the divine precept against theft as John Sadleir himself, and may be known by Him only to have wanted opportunities to rival that worthy's depredations.

The true distinction of sins depends altogether upon the disposition of mind in which the sin is committed: the attempt to classify them according to "gravity of matter" only leads to ludicrous absurdity. Who does not feel it to be an absurdity to define that a theft of 2s. 6d. destroys charity, separates from the love of God, and is punishable with eternal fire, whereas a theft of 2s. 5½d. would have been attended with none of these pernicious consequences; while again stealing 3s. 8½d. from two different people would be quite compatible with remaining in the love and favour of God? The absurdity of such decisions as these is simply ludicrous, and yet they naturally result from the system of the Church of Rome, which requires of all Christians to bring their sins periodically to be classed and tabulated by a priest. The poor priest cannot see the hearts, and has, therefore, no means of judging with any certainty of these circumstances of disposition of the mind of sinners in which the real differences between sins depend, and so he is compelled to look for some tangible, easily-found grounds of distinction. And so he can find nothing but "gravity of matter," and has recourse to his books, where he has everything comfortably settled for him, and where he finds the whole matter reduced to a regular tariff, the amount which can be stolen without mortal sin being regulated according to the income of the person defrauded.

We must say that the defence made for Father Furniss by the *Rambler* discloses deeper ignorance of the true nature of sin, and illustrates the lowering effects of the teaching of the Church of Rome on the moral judgments of her disciples, more forcibly than even Father Furniss's book itself.

For instance, the *Rambler* undertakes to defend the now celebrated decision of the Redemptorist Father, that it is no sin to "mix something with what you sell; for example, water with any liquor, if there is a common custom of doing it, or if it is necessary in order to gain a reasonable profit."

The *Rambler* thinks that such practices may possibly be undesirable or improper upon other and social grounds, but that the idea of their being *sins* is (to use a favourite expression of the *Rambler's*) "unmitigated fudge."

"Does the reviewer himself, when he swears—we beg his pardon, reviewers never swear—when he mildly remarks on the sky-blue tint of the fluid on his breakfast table, ever, in his own conscience, deliberately believe that the unfortunate vendor of milk and water, who has the honour of supplying him, is guilty of an absolute real sin against the great God of heaven and earth? Nonsense! He believes nothing of the sort, any more than a parliamentary opposition believe one-half of the charges they bring against those who are enjoying the blessed privilege of sitting on the Treasury benches. He may hold that watering milk or cabbaging cloth is an offence against society; but as for placing it in the category of positive, actual sins against Almighty God, it is all moonshine to pretend that any sensible person does so in his own mind."

It will be seen that the *Rambler* goes a step beyond Father Furniss; for Father Furniss has no objection to admit that watering milk and sanding pepper would be sins if carried to an extent greater than that sufficient to gain a reasonable profit. In his printed book, indeed, he has omitted to define what that extent is; but we have no doubt that in the spirit of rigid and accurate arithmetical definition which has fixed 2s. 6d. as the limit of theft without mortal sin, Father Furniss would have no objection to give private instructions fixing more precisely what he meant by a reasonable profit. If, for instance, he were to find that the milk vendors of a particular locality were in the habit of mixing but one part of water with two of milk, then he would decide that a milk vendor who should mix half and half was demanding an unreasonable profit, and therefore guilty of actual positive sin. When Father Furniss is at his breakfast table, however indifferent the beverage supplied to him may be, still as long as it is up to the average standard, he feels that the vendor is only using his legitimate privileges; but should some unusual falling off in the quality cause the good father to "swear, or mildly remark," as the case may be, then we gather from his book that, in defiance of the *Rambler*, he would pronounce the

seller to be guilty, not only of a breach of social duty, but of a positive sin against God.

The *Rambler*, however, not being so deeply read in books of casuistry as Father Furniss, feels strongly the absurdity of defining the exact per-centage of water which may be lawfully mixed with milk, and so he makes short work of the matter. He cannot believe it possible that the great God of heaven and earth can trouble Himself with such trifles. He cannot think that the Almighty God could stoop to regard such petty offences as the little dishonest artifices by which a poor shopkeeper tries to make a few pence more for his family. We shall not inquire whether this is a very consistent view of things to be taken by a member of a Church which holds that it is a mortal sin to eat more than one-eighth of an ounce of flesh meat on a day of abstinence, and which, therefore, must believe that there are some trifles which God does stoop to regard. But, consistent or not, the *Rambler* holds that this system of petty plunder, however socially inconvenient, is not disapproved by God, and is consistent with a high profession of religion. The *Rambler*, in short, sees nothing to find fault with in the directions of the grocer in the story to his boy. "Peter, have you sanded the sugar? Yes. Have you dusted the pepper? Yes. Have you watered the rum? Yes. Then put up the shutters and come in to prayers."

We do not hesitate to say that the whole tone of the *Rambler* on this subject is absolutely inconsistent with the spirit of Christianity. True Christianity tolerates no divorce between religion and morality. The true Christian considers himself bound to do *all things* to the glory of God, and regards all the ordinary duties of his daily and social life as work given him to do by the Master who has redeemed him—work which he is bound to do faithfully for His sake and in His sight. Let any one compare the doctrine of the *Rambler* with the directions which St. Paul gives to the Christian slaves who were among his converts as to the spirit in which they were to discharge their daily tasks, and when he has studied the teaching of St. Paul, let him judge what the great Apostle would have said if he had heard one of his professing followers at the same time condemning conduct as an offence against society, and pronouncing it innocent in the sight of God, and such as a Christian might lawfully commit, as far as God's judgment was concerned.

There are many more points suggested by these attempts to prop up the morality of "What every Christian must know," but we fear that we have already made our article too long.

THE RELIGION OF PICTURES.

THE religion of the Church of Rome must advance. There is no standing still in the way she has chosen to herself. Error must be propagated, or it falls. Men must learn new notions of religion which their fathers knew not, or the Church of Rome cannot accomplish its objects.

And to aid that progression of error, without which it cannot hold its ground, everything that is beautiful in nature or conception must be degraded into instruments of falsehood, as if, of all things which God has made, TRUTH alone could not be beautiful.

Yet TRUTH is beautiful in itself; and FALSEHOOD is hateful in itself. For that very reason FALSEHOOD must try to look beautiful in itself, and must try to make TRUTH look ugly.

It is an old story. St. Paul complains that "false apostles are deceitful workmen, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ; and no wonder, for Satan himself transformeth himself into an angel of light. Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers be transformed as the ministers of justice, whose end shall be according to their works." 2 Cor. xi. 13, 14, 15.

To follow this example is all that now remains for the Church of Rome, in the course on which she has entered.

We say this, having before our eyes a skilful and beautiful device of "a deceitful workman."

The religion of the Church of Rome is fast becoming a religion of pictures. Pictures now wink their eyes to establish articles of faith; and pictures must, of course, support the articles of faith which they promulgate.

He who will now seek the religion of the Church of Rome, must seek it her pictures, where he will find it, and not in the Douay Bible, where he will not find it.

We have, accordingly, visited a well-known shop, not twenty miles from Essex-bridge, established in this city of Dublin for propagating the religion of the Church of Rome.

That picture shop is, of course, known to Archbishop Cullen. If he disapproved of that shop, he would, of course, require it to be closed, or would, at least, warn "the faithful" against the extensive trade which it is there carrying on, as much as he warns them against the CATHOLIC LAYMAN. He has warned them against this paper; he has not warned them against the wares of this shop. We presume, therefore, that he considers its pictures unobjectionable, or even deserving of his approbation.

From purchases at the picture mart, we have selected

as the subject of this article a picture drawn by a French priest—the Abbe Lambert.^b

It is a double picture, having two pictures on one sheet. The picture opposite the left hand commemorates the "Immaculate Conception;" that opposite the right hand, the "Perpetual Adoration of the Holy Sacrament."

Both these things have been established by the present Pope. He, for the first time, has made "the Immaculate Conception" an article of faith in the Church of Rome. He has also established in some Church (we believe at Rome) a perpetual adoration of the sacrament.

The Church of Rome is now responsible for these things. The things must, therefore, be represented in such a garb as will make them look beautiful. "A deceitful workman" is wanted; and the Abbe Lambert, a priest of the Church of Rome, comes forward as well skilled in that department, and his work is sold in Dublin, to the great contentment of Dr. Cullen.

As a work of art, we feel bound to give Abbe Lambert's picture a very high commendation. Considering the pains taken with the execution of it, and the price at which it is sold, it is clearly not intended for the poor or the ignorant, but for those who can spend money, and who can appreciate the beauties of art. It is to introduce to them "the religion of pictures" that it is got up; and those who live by selling such things must expect that they will sell.

We will now give a description of this picture, to illustrate what we mean by "the religion of pictures."

The picture opposite the right hand is in commemoration of "the perpetual adoration." At the top is a picture of GOD THE FATHER, which the ancient Christians thought it profane to make. Immediately underneath is a picture of a dove, as representing the Holy Spirit. Underneath is the picture of our Saviour, extending to the foot of the painting.

On either side of God the Father are the cherubims. On the left hand side is the motto, "The Court celestial love and adore;" on the right hand side, "The Court celestial love and revere."

Immediately between the Dove and the head of our Saviour is a cup, held by an angel on the left side, with the motto, "The angel of perpetual adoration." On the left hand side are other angels, with the motto, "Anges de l'amende honorable." We give this in the French, really not knowing how to translate it in an ecclesiastical sense.

On the left of the picture, and the right hand side of our Saviour, stands Pope Pius IX., with the triple crown upon his head, and bedizened with all kinds of gorgeous apparel, with the motto, "SS. Pius IX. founding the perpetual adoration." On the right are various figures, with the motto, "The religious of the perpetual adoration," meaning, we suppose, the order established to perpetuate it.

Lower down, on the left hand side, are other figures, with the motto, "The whole Hierarchy of the Church." On the right hand side are figures, with the motto, "Innocence and repentance." And at the foot are, on the left hand side, figures in monkish dresses, with the motto, "The different religious orders;" and on the right hand other figures, with the motto, "The different states of the Church."

All these figures are in the attitude of prayer. The object of that prayer is indicated in a scroll proceeding from the hands of Pope Pius IX. That scroll bears the words, "WE ADORE FOR EVER THE MOST HOLY SACRAMENT." The other end of the scroll passes by the head of Christ, to point to the cup in the angel's hand. THE OBJECT of the worship of Pope Pius IX., and all his Church, and all the host of heaven, as far as he can direct them, is not the figure of Christ in this picture, but the holy sacrament in the hand of the angel. It is the best representation we have seen of the worship of the modern Church of Rome. But what would St. Cyprian, and St. Basil, and St. Ambrose, and St. Augustine have said to such a picture?

And it is worthy of observation that the present pope, Pius IX., is represented as "founding the perpetual adoration;" and just over him is "the angel of the perpetual adoration," holding the cup. Who appointed this angel to take charge of the "perpetual adoration?" Was it God? If so, where is the revelation of it? Was it the Pope? If so, where is his authority over the angels of God?

But we must proceed to the picture opposite the left hand, which is intended to commemorate the immaculate conception.

We conceive it to be our duty to describe this picture, although the task be painful to the reverence which as Christians we feel towards God.

At the top of the picture is a representation of the Holy Trinity. We try to speak of it with due reverence. God the Father and God the Son are represented as a MAN, with two heads, one body, and two arms. One of the heads is like the ordinary pictures of our Saviour. The other is the head of an old man, surmounted by a triangle. Out of the middle of this figure is proceeding the Holy Ghost in the form of a dove. We think it must be painful to any Christian mind, and repugnant to Christian feeling, to look at this figure. On either side, the cherubim and heavenly host are represented. Just

^b In the lower left hand corner are the words, "L'Abbe Lambert pinxit."

^a See the Picture of Rimini, CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. I., p. 64.

Under this representation there is a figure of the Virgin Mary, sitting on a throne. Just under this picture of the Virgin Mary is another picture of the Virgin, standing in a niche. We were at first perplexed to know why the Abbe Lambert has given two Virgin Marys, the one over the other. But a careful examination discloses the reason. The upper Mary sits on a throne, with an inscription round her head, "Mary, conceived without sin," the lower Mary is standing, and Pope Pius IX., with his triple crown and his gay clothing, is placing a crown upon her head. We remember to have read that the Pope performed this act to her statue or image at the time he decreed the immaculate conception. This explains the picture. The upper Mary is Mary on the throne as "Queen of Heaven;" the lower Mary is Mary upon earth, receiving a crown and dignity from the Pope in the nineteenth century; which fact we have always considered must have been more for the Pope's glorification than for hers. Therefore the lower figure of Mary was indispensable in the picture.

But something more in the picture is yet to be spoken of. From the top to the bottom, at either side of the principal figures, there are other figures introduced with appropriate "texts" in the margin; and these "texts" contain the substance and object of the whole picture.

In the left hand corner at the top is a figure of the rising sun with the "text" in the margin, taken from Canticles vi., 9 (Douay Bible), "Bright as the sun."

Below this, on the left hand side of the picture, opposite to the Mary on the throne, are various figures, apparently meant for the prophets, with David and his harp among them; and in the margin is the "text," "The holy prophets have said that Mary was conceived without sin."

Below this, but still opposite to the Mary on the throne, are other figures, with this text in the margin, "The Apostles have said that Mary was conceived without sin."

Below this, just at the Pope's back, as he stands crowning the lower Mary, are other figures, with this "text," "The holy councils have said that Mary was conceived without sin."

Underneath is another "text," apparently meant for the Pope himself: "The sovereign Pontiffs have said that Mary was conceived without sin."

Below it again is another text: "Miracles have said that Mary was conceived without sin."

At the foot of the picture is a rainbow, and in the blue sky underneath a trap door closed, on which sits an angel with a flaming sword; on the trap door is the motto in French, "Puits de l'abyme fermé."

Ascending the margin at the right hand the lowest "text" is, "Catholic instinct has said that Mary was conceived without sin."

Next above are some figures with the "text," "The holy doctors have said that Mary was conceived without sin."

Beside the standing Mary whom the Pope crowns is a figure in blue with a triple crozier, intended to represent the Church, with this "text," "Tradition has said that Mary was conceived without sin."

At this side of the Mary on the throne are other figures, with the "text," "The evangelists have said that Mary was conceived without sin."

A little higher up is a company of angels, with the text, "Angels have said that Mary was conceived without sin."

A figure of the moon in the upper corner has this text, also taken from Cant. vi., 9, "Beautiful as the moon."

The whole is closed in with this text in the margin at the top, just over the representation of the Trinity, "GOD THE FATHER, SON, AND HOLY GHOST HAVE SAID THAT MARY WAS CONCEIVED WITHOUT SIN!"

And if all these have said it, why has the Church of Rome never said it till now? For so we find it confessed in the famous letter of Pope Pius IX., dated 2nd February, 1849. "This honour has not yet been decreed to the most holy Virgin by the Church and the Apostolic See."

The Pope has, since writing that letter, decreed the immaculate conception; and the Church of Rome must now establish it or fall: hence "deceitful workmen" must transform themselves into the apostles of Christ, to get it believed.

What innocent Catholic could imagine that so beautiful a picture was drawn, and that, too, by a priest of the Church of Rome, the Abbe Lambert, and sold in this city, to the great satisfaction of the Pope's Legate, merely that it might be garnished all down the margin with LYING TEXTS?

For let them tell us where have the Prophets, the Angels, the Apostles, the Evangelists, the Councils, the Doctors, up to St. Bernard's time, 1200 years after Christ, ever said that Mary was conceived without sin?

This is now the "great text" of the Church of Rome. It is not to be found in the Scriptures, nor in the Councils, nor in the Fathers; but it is now found in the pictures of the Church of Rome. If any one wants to know what the religion of modern Rome really is, let him not look in the Scriptures, or the Councils, or the Fathers. Let him look in the picture shop for the religion of priests of the Church of Rome.

Thus we have given some of the fruits of our first visit to the picture shop, patronized, we believe, by the Association for the Propagation of the Faith. We may, perhaps, call there again to learn something more of "the religion of pictures."

* See this Letter in the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. I., No. 1, pp. 5 and 6.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber.

The CATHOLIC LAYMAN is registered for transmission beyond the United Kingdom.

In consequence of several persons having returned copies of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, which had been already paid for by friends, under the apprehension that they might be called on hereafter in person to pay for them, we beg to call their attention to the following announcement—viz., that any one receiving any number of this journal which has not been ordered by himself or by his authority, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, JULY 17, 1857.

THE *Edinburgh Review* for the current month of July opens with an article on the "Confraternity of La Salette," which the Roman Catholic Bishop of Birmingham, Dr. Ullathorne, has been for some three years past endeavouring, with but little success, to introduce into Protestant England.

The reviewer, after giving the formal approbation of Dr. Ullathorne, prefixed to the "manual" of the Rev. John Wyse upon the subject, and extracting from it the story of the "apparition," with which our readers are already familiar, and then giving an outline of the proofs, now twice successfully brought forward before legal tribunals, that Mademoiselle Constance Lamerlière de St. Ferreol was the real heroine of the pretended miracle, proceeds to expose the utter falsehood of the assertion of Dr. Ullathorne and his colleague, Mr. Wyse, that it had "received the approval and encouragement of every bishop to whom application has been made for exerting it, and that no authority has spoken against it."

"It is due to the clergy of France," says the reviewer, "to show that they have not unanimously encouraged these scandalous doctrines which Dr. Ullathorne commends to the devotion and faith of the British public. Monseigneur Depéry, Bishop of Gap (the adjoining diocese to Grenoble), addressed to his clergy, in 1851, the following letter:—'It concerns our duty and our conscience to warn the clergy and the faithful that we are strangers to this manoeuvre, and that they would be the dupes of a criminal intrigue and a shameful speculation if they allowed themselves to believe that we patronize an occurrence in which we neither can nor will take any part. Several miraculous cures have been stated to have occurred in this our diocese. We declare that we have not been able to establish any one of them! Advise religious persons to be on their guard against such stories when they have not been verified by scrupulous inquiry. We peremptorily forbid the recitation of the service of La Salette in our diocese.' The Bishop of Bellegarde held similar language. Monseigneur Dupanloup, Bishop of Orleans, wrote to one of his friends at Grenoble in 1851—'The further I go, the more I hear, the less can I discover the spirit of God in all this. I cannot agree with your clergy on all these things. Faith and charity are lost amidst all this noise, this confusion, this division. As for M. Rousselot and his books, the matter and the manner in which he treats it are a real scandal. Be assured that they are full of danger to faith and good morals.' These are the direct reverse of Dr. Ullathorne's certificate of approval."

"In 1854 the Bishop of Mans, who passes for the first theologian in France, enjoined on all his clergy to pay no attention to La Salette. The Bishop of Poitiers refused his authority to print the Litanies of La Salette. The late Archbishop of Paris prohibited the sale of the holy water of Salette. The Archbishops of Bordeaux, Avignon, Turin, and Aix have all expressed more or less openly their disapproval and disbelief of this pantomime, and the Pope himself, when the pretended secrets of the children were laid before him, declared that they were revolting nonsense, brought to him by a couple of crazy priests, and fit only for the waste-paper basket. This fact is given on the authority of M. de Ségur, an auditor of the Rote, who heard the Pope use this language; and it is notorious that the French bishops who have since visited Rome have received the Pope's advice to let the affair of La Salette fall to the ground; yet the authoritative promulgation of the apparition subsists; the new Bishop of Grenoble has not had the courage to put an end to this fraud; the high authorities of the Church have not formally prohibited it; and an English Roman Catholic chooses to recommend it to the especial devotion of the faithful in this country."

The reviewer is evidently not a writer who would interfere with the religious liberty which the Roman Catholics of England enjoy, and are entitled to enjoy, in common with all their fellow countrymen, or disposed to speak with disrespect or intolerance of the distinctive theological tenets of the Church of Rome; but expresses his conviction, in which we cordially concur, that the best informed and most pious of the English (Roman) Catholics are ashamed of the whole matter and would repudiate it if they dared. He presents to his readers some reflections upon it, which we think well worthy the consideration of every sincere Roman Catholic, who prefers the honour of his Church and spiritual welfare of his co-religionists to the aggrandisement of a section of dishonest priests who would enrich themselves by fostering an imposture.

"What becomes of the boasted uniformity of belief and practice of the Romish Church, or the immutable basis of infallible authority, if on an occasion like this it fails to protect the weak and the unwary from gross imposition and debasing misbelief. We may pass by with a smile a few ecstatic visions and pretended cures. They denote, at most, the aberrations of the human imagination; but the apparition of La Salette belongs to a different class of events. It purports to be nothing less than the visible appearance upon earth of a being whom the Romish Church invests with Divine attributes, and has recently made to partake of the Divine nature. This being assumes the language of Omnipotence, presumes to warn, to judge, to admonish the earth, though in terms little fitted to so stupendous an occasion. If such an event could be shown within the bounds of probability, and were supported by any evidence to command belief, it would at once become the most solemn and amazing incident in the history of the world since the ascension of our Lord. It is that, or it is nothing; it is that, or it is a lie; the scandal and the blasphemy of which are commensurate with the awful subject of such a caricature."

"We cannot assent to the mild view taken of this case by some of the Catholic prelates, who disbelieve in the miracle, but who would fain pass it over in silence, and hope that it will be forgotten. Tried by the standard of a higher morality, it is either a truth or an unparalleled iniquity, an opprobrium to the Church, and an offence to religion. Can there be a greater offence in the eyes of God and man than a deliberate conspiring to convert the vagaries of a half-witted nun into a divine revelation, to render this unfortunate wretch an object of worship, and to erect a temple to her on the scene of her performance? Yet in all lands to which the Catholic priest has penetrated—from the forges of Birmingham to the islands of the Pacific Ocean—this conspiracy has spread, and is spreading, to the eternal disgrace of its authors. The fact is, that they found, like Frankenstein, they had given a shape to a monster which was too strong for them. They had set in motion so many of the baser elements of human nature, that they lost the power of controlling them."

"The history of vulgar errors is one of the most curious pages in the records of human society. We have daily experience, without invading the precincts of religion, of the eagerness with which every marvellous absurdity is caught up and propagated, and of the difficulty of effacing its pernicious traces. But we hardly know of any example in which a fraud of this magnitude has been cultivated with equal success, or in which its progress can be so regularly followed. Shall we say—for we say it with pain—that, after all, there are many things that men love better than truth? They prefer to it their own false gods, and for that reason the Almighty set the first canon of His law against idolatry. They prefer to it power; they prefer to it wealth; they prefer to it mere wonder. To all these things truth is perpetually sacrificed. The noblest and the rarest act of an exalted nature is to suffer and even to die in manliness and simplicity for truth alone."

The reviewer explains the success of the imposture of Mademoiselle Lamerlière in the following simple manner. "The diocese of Grenoble was governed down to 1853 by Philibert de Bruillard, a prelate born in 1765, who had, consequently, considerably passed his eightieth year at the time of these singular events; in addition to his extreme age, the Bishop appears to have been of a feeble, credulous, and incautious character. On some former occasions he had declared the authenticity of certain miraculous cures and prodigies which had brought scandal on the Church by the obvious falsehood and disgusting details which accompanied them. Practically, the episcopal authority was chiefly exercised by two priests—the one, M. Rousselot, one of the canons of the cathedral of Grenoble,